

## REMARKS

Claims 1-21 remain pending in this application.

In paragraph 2 of the Office action, the Examiner suggests that in order to benefit from the claim to foreign priority, a certified English translation of the priority documents is required. Applicants have claimed the benefit of foreign priority and submitted the required documents which the Office has acknowledged. In the absence of an intervening reference, no translation should be required. MPEP 201.15. Even in this case, a certified translation is not required, but the translation must include a statement regarding the accuracy of the translation.

Claims 4-6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because it was not clear what applicants were claiming. Claim 4 has been amended in accordance with the specification disclosure at, for example, paragraphs 0021 and 0022, to remove any ambiguity from these claims. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-3 and 7-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Yokota et al. (WO 03/022594, wherein the citations are from the English equivalent document US Pg-Pub 2004/0157162). The Office has provided a very thorough analysis of the teachings of this publication as it is intended to be applied to the rejected claims. The Office also acknowledged applicant's observation that the inventors of this publication are the same as the inventors named in the present application. The observation was not intended as a challenge to the prior art status of Yokota et al., but to point out that applicants in this application are in a unique position to provide an opinion on the content of the Yokota et al. disclosure because it was their own work.

It continues to be applicants' position that Yokota et al. does not teach the use of an organic silicon compound having no polymerizable unsaturated group as required by each of the pending claims. Contrary to the position of the Office, Yokota et al. does not disclose that a plastomer, including an organic silicon compound such as polydimethylsiloxane, may replace at least a part of resin (a), but that at least a part of resin (a) may be a plastomer that is modified to introduce a polymerizable unsaturated group in accordance with the requirements for resin (a) (see paragraph 0057).

The Examiner has pointed to the teachings of paragraph 0054 of Yokota et al. to the effect that one or more polymers can be used as resin (a) and, when a plurality of different polymers is used in combination, the polymers may be in the form of either a copolymer or a polymer blend. However, this does not state or even suggest that any component used as resin (a) can be free of the requirement of having a polymerizable unsaturated group (see paragraph 0047 of Yokota et al.). The polymer of Yokota et al., in the form of either a copolymer or a polymer blend still must have a polymerizable unsaturated group.

The Examiner further recognizes that Yokota et al. discloses that at least a part of resin (a) can be a plastomer (paragraph 0055), but incorrectly concludes that this ingredient is equivalent to the organic silicon compound of the claimed invention that is free of polymerizable unsaturated groups. It is not equivalent, and this is plainly evident from the disclosure that it is preferred (last sentence in paragraph 0055) that the plastomer be used in an amount of 30 to 100% by weight, based on the total weight of the resins used as resin (a) (emphasis supplied). Where polydimethylsiloxane is used as 100% of resin (a) it must be functionalized with a polymerizable unsaturated group in

order to meet the requirements of resin (a). It is clear that the option of using a polydimethylsiloxane is used as a raw material for resin (a) that must be functionalized by introducing polymerizable unsaturated groups into said polymer according to the method described in paragraph 0057 before it can serve as a component of resin (a).

The claimed invention is distinguished from the teachings of Yokota et al. by requiring the use of an organic silicon compound having no polymerizable unsaturated group in the molecule. When properly understood and interpreted, according to the same inventors also associated with the Yokota et al. disclosure, Yokota et al. does not teach or suggest the claimed invention. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Prompt and favorable reconsideration of this application is requested.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: March 2, 2010

By: Charles E. Van Horn  
Charles E. Van Horn  
Reg. No. 40,266  
(202) 408-4000